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### **decision tree for ethical dilemma.pdf**

7 lines  
pdf  
**C**  
I have a decision tree framework I want students to use to help them visualize and capture a personal ethical dilemma using specific criteria I have already developed. I would like to upload this framework and then work with you to draft a markdown prompt that could be pasted into an AI agent to assist students in working through that capture process. I don't want you to immediately try to draft the prompt, but just make sure we agree on parameters first.  
Edit  
I understand you'd like to collaborate on creating a markdown prompt that will help students use your decision tree framework to work through personal ethical dilemmas. You want to make sure we're aligned on the parameters before I draft anything.  
I notice the document you uploaded appears to be empty or didn't load properly - I'm not seeing any content from your decision tree framework. Could you either:

1. Re-upload the framework document, or
2. Share the key elements of your decision tree and criteria directly in your message?

Once I can see your framework, I'd be happy to discuss the parameters for the prompt, such as:

* The target audience (what level/type of students)
* The tone and approach you want the AI agent to take
* How directive vs. exploratory you want the process to be
* Whether you want specific output formats or structures
* Any particular pedagogical approaches you want incorporated

What would work best for sharing your framework?  
Retry

### **Part 1 - Ethical Dilemma Prompt.md**

134 lines  
md  
**C**  
Edit  
Perfect! Now I can see your comprehensive decision tree framework. This is a well-structured approach that guides students through identifying genuine ethical dilemmas with competing obligations rather than simple right/wrong situations.  
Before I draft the markdown prompt, let me confirm my understanding of the key parameters:  
Framework Elements I See:

* 6-step decision tree with clear annotations
* AI coaching instructions emphasizing guidance over solutions
* Final check questions for validation
* Common pitfalls section with examples
* Process for AI to generate a draft summary once dilemma is confirmed

Questions to align on parameters:

1. Target Audience: What level are these students? (undergraduate, graduate, professional development?)
2. AI Agent Role: I see you want the AI to be a coach/guide rather than solution-provider. Should the tone be more conversational/supportive or more structured/academic?
3. Process Flow: You want students to copy the coaching instructions and work through the tree with AI help. Should the final prompt I create be:
   * Just the coaching instructions (students refer back to your document for the tree)?
   * The coaching instructions + embedded tree for easy reference?
   * Something else?
4. Output Expectations: The AI should help generate that final "Ethical Dilemma Draft" - any specific format or length you want for that summary?
5. Safeguards: Any particular boundaries you want built in (e.g., avoiding certain types of personal/sensitive topics)?

## What's your preference on these points? Retry **C** Actually, this document represents the prompt I thought I needed to create. But I would like to test to see if the final output matches what I envision. Could you generate a sample student response using the process outlined in the prompt I uploaded? Edit I'll work through your process as if I'm a student using the AI coaching instructions. Let me start by "pasting" the coaching instructions into a conversation and then work through the decision tree.

[As a student beginning the process]  
Hi, I'm working through an ethical dilemma identification process for a class. I need to find a personal situation that involves competing ethical obligations that I can analyze over a semester.  
I'm thinking about a situation at my part-time job. I work at a local coffee shop, and I've noticed that my manager consistently schedules fewer hours for the older employees (people in their 50s and 60s) and gives more of the busy weekend shifts to younger workers like me. The older employees have mentioned they need those weekend tips to supplement their income, but my manager says the younger staff are "more energetic" and "better with the weekend crowd."  
I'm not sure if this is age discrimination or just practical scheduling. I could speak up about it, but I also really need this job and don't want to create problems. What do you think I should do?  
[As the AI coach responding]  
I can hear that this situation is weighing on you - that tension between seeing something that feels unfair and worrying about your own position is real. Rather than jumping to what you should do, let's first explore what's happening here and what roles you're occupying.  
You mentioned you work there and need the job, but you're also observing what seems like unfair treatment. Tell me more about your actual position in this situation - are you just receiving the schedule, or do you have any input into how shifts are assigned? What kind of relationships do you have with both the older employees and your manager?  
[Continuing the conversation through the decision tree...]  
Well, I don't make the schedule, but I could talk to my manager about it. I've become friends with some of the older employees - they've been really helpful training me. And my manager seems to like me and asks for my input on other things sometimes.  
[AI coach continues guiding through Decision Point 1]  
That's helpful context. So you do have some agency here - you could choose to speak up or not. Let's think about the different roles you're occupying in this situation. You mentioned being an employee who needs the job, and it sounds like you're also positioned as someone your coworkers have invested in training and befriending. Are there other roles or identities that feel relevant to how you're experiencing this situation?  
[Student works through multiple roles - employee, beneficiary of potentially unfair system, friend/colleague, person with values about fairness]  
[Process continues through all decision points...]  
[Final result after working through the entire tree and confirming YES to all final check questions]  
Ethical Dilemma Draft:  
As a part-time coffee shop employee, I face competing obligations regarding my manager's scheduling practices that appear to disadvantage older workers in favor of younger staff like myself.  
Core Situation: My manager consistently assigns fewer lucrative weekend shifts to employees in their 50s and 60s, citing that younger workers are "more energetic" and "better with the weekend crowd," while the older employees have expressed they rely on weekend tips to supplement their income.  
Key Roles and Competing Obligations:

* Employee dependent on job security: Speaking up risks my position and income
* Beneficiary of current system: I receive preferred shifts that older colleagues need
* Friend/colleague: Older employees invested time training me and building relationships
* Person with fairness values: I believe age-based scheduling decisions may be discriminatory

## Ethical Complexity: Different frameworks suggest different approaches - utilitarian analysis might weigh collective harm against individual risk, while duty-based ethics might focus on obligations to speak against potential discrimination regardless of personal cost. The ongoing nature of scheduling decisions means this dilemma will persist throughout my employment. Stakeholder Groups: Older employees facing reduced income, younger employees benefiting from current system, management maintaining what they see as efficient operations, customers receiving service, and my own multiple role obligations. This situation has ongoing significance as it represents recurring scheduling decisions and reflects broader questions about workplace fairness, personal integrity, and the responsibilities that come with benefiting from potentially unfair systems.

Does this sample process and final output match what you envisioned your students would produce?  
Retry  
**C**  
I believe so. Does the current version of the prompt suggest or recommend the creation of a downloadable artifact that could be forwarded to the instructor for review after this process is complete?  
Edit  
Looking back at your prompt, I can see it does mention this! In the AI Coaching Instructions section, after the student confirms "YES" to all Final Check Questions, it states:

* Offer to generate an initial draft of their Ethical Dilemma for their review and approval.
* Instruct the student to save this Ethical Dilemma Draft as a standalone document.

However, the current language is somewhat buried in the middle of the coaching instructions and uses fairly general language ("save this...as a standalone document").  
In my sample process above, I didn't explicitly offer to create a downloadable artifact or clearly instruct the student about forwarding it to their instructor. The prompt could be clearer about:

1. Explicitly offering to create a downloadable/shareable document (rather than just "save as standalone")
2. Mentioning that this draft is specifically for instructor review
3. Maybe suggesting a specific format (like a markdown artifact that can be easily copied/downloaded)

Would you like me to suggest some revisions to make this step more prominent and explicit in the coaching instructions? Or does the current version work well enough as written?  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's worry about that later; I just want to see the artifact since I am planning on using it to test the same process for Part 2.  
Edit  
Student Ethical Dilemma Draft for Instructor Review  
Document  
# Ethical Dilemma Draft for Instructor Review

\*\*Student:\*\* [Sample Student Response]  
\*\*Date:\*\* July 30, 2025

## Core Situation

As a part-time coffee shop employee, I face competing obligations regarding my manager's scheduling practices that app  
Here's the downloadable artifact that a student could forward to their instructor for review. This format captures the key elements from working through your decision tree process and presents them in a structured way that would allow an instructor to quickly assess whether the student has identified a workable ethical dilemma for semester-long analysis.  
Retry

### **Part 2 - Ethical Heuristics Prompt.md**

## 201 lines md **C** OK. Using this simulated draft as a representation for Part 1, let's try the Part 2 prompt, using the same thought process that informed the responses for Part 1. Be sure to produce the final product for Part 2 as outlined in the prompt. Edit I'll work through your Part 2 process as the same student, using the ethical dilemma draft from Part 1. Let me start by "pasting" the AI interviewing instructions and then beginning with the starter prompt.

## [As the student beginning Part 2] I've completed Part 1 of the Ethical Dilemma Identification process and need help discovering the ethical heuristics - the actual decision-making patterns, principles, and 'if/then' rules - that guide my behavior in each of the roles I identified. I understand this interview process may uncover patterns I'm not entirely comfortable with, but I'm committed to being honest about what I actually do versus what I think I should do. I want to understand the real ethical 'algorithms' that drive my decision-making so I can thoughtfully compare them with formal ethical frameworks throughout the semester. Please begin the heuristics discovery interview by requesting my Part 1 findings. [As the AI interviewer responding] Thank you for your commitment to honest self-examination - that's exactly what will make this process valuable. I'd like to start by reviewing your complete Part 1 findings so I can understand the specific roles and competing obligations you identified. Could you share your ethical dilemma analysis from Part 1? [Student shares the Part 1 artifact] [AI interviewer continues] Perfect. I can already see some potential heuristics emerging from your Part 1 responses. Let me start with a few observations: In your employee role, you seem to operate with something like "When job security is threatened, prioritize self-preservation over speaking up" - though I sense there's tension there. In your friend/colleague role, I notice something like "When people invest in helping me, I owe them loyalty and consideration in return." And in your person with fairness values role, there seems to be "When I witness potential discrimination, I feel obligated to act - but other obligations can override this." Do these feel accurate as starting points? What would you adjust or add to those initial observations? [Continuing the interview process...] Student: Those feel pretty accurate, though uncomfortable. The job security one especially - I don't like that I prioritize keeping my job over doing what's right, but honestly, that's what happens in my head first. AI: That discomfort you're feeling often signals we're hitting authentic patterns rather than aspirational ones - that's exactly what we need to explore. Let's dig into that job security heuristic. Walk me through your thinking when you first notice the scheduling pattern. What actually goes through your mind in those moments? [Process continues through detailed exploration...] [After comprehensive interview covering all roles, contradictions, and behavioral patterns] [AI provides final compilation] Based on our conversation, here's your comprehensive heuristics profile:

## **EMPLOYEE Role**

Core Principles:

* Self-preservation: "My financial stability comes first when workplace conflicts arise"
* Pragmatic loyalty: "Stay valuable to management while maintaining plausible deniability about problems I can't fix"

Key Virtues:

* Reliability (being someone management can count on)
* Discretion (not creating unnecessary workplace drama)

If/Then Heuristics:

* If speaking up threatens my job security, then find indirect ways to address the issue or stay silent
* If I benefit from a questionable system, then I can justify staying quiet as long as I'm not actively participating in harm
* If my manager asks my opinion, then frame concerns in business terms rather than moral ones
* If I'm new to a workplace, then observe patterns for at least 3 months before taking any action
* If there's a way to help individuals privately without challenging the system, then do that instead of making formal complaints

## Notable Insights: Strong conflict between stated values and protective instincts; uses "I'm too new" as ongoing justification

## **FRIEND/COLLEAGUE Role**

Core Principles:

* Reciprocal loyalty: "People who invest in me deserve my consideration and protection"
* Relational harm minimization: "Don't let systems hurt the individuals I care about"

Key Virtues:

* Gratitude (honoring those who helped me)
* Protective care (looking out for vulnerable colleagues)

If/Then Heuristics:

* If someone has trained or mentored me, then I owe them advocacy and consideration
* If I can help a colleague individually without systemic confrontation, then I should do so
* If colleagues confide struggles to me, then I have responsibility to care about their wellbeing
* If I have to choose between institutional loyalty and personal loyalty, then personal relationships usually win
* If someone is being treated unfairly and I have any influence, then I should use it quietly on their behalf

## Notable Insights: This role often conflicts with employee role; tends to drive guilt about not doing more

## **PERSON WITH FAIRNESS VALUES Role**

Core Principles:

* Justice awareness: "Discrimination and unfairness should be challenged"
* Moral consistency: "My actions should align with my stated values"

Key Virtues:

* Integrity (being true to my moral beliefs)
* Courage (standing up for what's right)

If/Then Heuristics:

* If I witness clear discrimination, then I should document it and consider formal action
* If my own comfort comes from others' disadvantage, then I should feel guilty about it
* If I have privilege in a situation, then I have extra responsibility to speak up
* If there's a "right" thing to do but it costs me personally, then I should do it anyway (aspirational)
* If I stay silent about injustice, then I become complicit in it

## Notable Insights: Most aspirational role; creates significant internal tension when other roles override these heuristics

## **BENEFICIARY OF UNFAIR SYSTEM Role**

Core Principles:

* Uncomfortable privilege recognition: "I benefit from something that hurts others"
* Guilt management: "Find ways to justify or minimize my advantaged position"

Key Virtues:

* Humility (recognizing unearned advantages)
* Awareness (not being willfully blind to system dynamics)

If/Then Heuristics:

* If I'm benefiting from others' disadvantage, then I should at least acknowledge it internally
* If I can't change a system, then small individual kindnesses help reduce my guilt
* If someone else is worse off because of my advantages, then I should feel bad about it but not necessarily give up the advantage
* If I'm going to keep unfair benefits, then I need to find ways to "pay it forward"
* If confronting the system means losing my advantages, then I look for compromise positions

## Notable Insights: Most uncomfortable role to examine; generates significant cognitive dissonance

## **Cross-Role Patterns:**

Meta-Heuristics:

* When roles conflict, immediate practical needs (job, money, relationships) usually trump abstract principles
* Guilt serves as a signal but rarely drives action when costs are high
* Individual kindness often substitutes for systemic action
* "I'm too new/junior/powerless" becomes a recurring justification across roles

Conflict Resolution:

* Prioritize roles based on immediate personal cost/benefit
* Look for win-win solutions that avoid forcing hard choices between roles
* When forced to choose, tend to favor roles tied to concrete relationships over abstract principles

Prioritization Rules:

1. Immediate survival needs (job security, income)
2. Direct personal relationships (people who have helped me)
3. Broader fairness principles (when they don't conflict with above)
4. Institutional loyalty (lowest priority unless it serves other needs)

## This heuristics profile reveals a complex ethical system where practical considerations often override stated values, but guilt and relationship obligations create ongoing internal tension that may eventually drive action.

[As the student]  
Wow, this is both accurate and uncomfortable. I especially don't like seeing how often I use "I'm too new" as an excuse, or how my fairness values basically get overruled by everything else. But you're right - this is what I actually do, not what I think I should do.  
Would this be comprehensive enough for semester-long analysis against formal ethical frameworks?  
Retry  
**C**  
Excellent! This is just where I hoped students would end up after these two interactions. Phew!  
Edit  
That's wonderful! It sounds like the two-part process is working exactly as you designed it. The progression from identifying a genuine ethical dilemma with competing roles in Part 1 to uncovering the authentic (and often uncomfortable) decision-making patterns in Part 2 creates a really solid foundation for deeper philosophical work.  
I can see how this sets students up perfectly for the rest of the semester - they'll have:

1. A real, personally meaningful dilemma they can't easily dismiss or solve
2. Multiple authentic roles with genuine competing obligations
3. A detailed map of their actual ethical operating system (not their aspirational one)
4. Plenty of internal contradictions and tensions to explore through different ethical frameworks
5. Emotional investment in the analysis because it's their own authentic patterns

The fact that the sample student ended up feeling "uncomfortable" with their discovered patterns is probably a great sign - it means they're ready to genuinely engage with alternative ethical frameworks rather than just confirming what they already believe.  
Are you planning to have them work through formal ethical frameworks (utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, etc.) against these discovered heuristics next? That comparison should generate some really rich analysis and probably some genuine shifts in how they think about ethical decision-making.  
The process seems robust and well-designed for getting students past surface-level ethical reasoning into the messy, personal work where real learning happens!  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's start working on Part 3, shall we?  
Edit  
Absolutely! I'm excited to see how you're planning to build on that solid foundation from Parts 1 and 2.  
Part 3 sounds like it would involve students taking their discovered personal heuristics and systematically comparing them against formal ethical frameworks - seeing how utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, care ethics, etc. would approach their specific dilemma differently than their current "ethical algorithm."  
Before I start making assumptions about the structure or approach, what's your vision for Part 3? Are you thinking:

* A systematic framework-by-framework analysis?
* A more integrated comparison approach?
* Something that builds toward a synthesis or refined personal ethical system?
* A focus on practical application back to their original dilemma?

And what's the end goal you're hoping students reach by the completion of Part 3?  
I want to make sure I understand your pedagogical intentions before we start crafting the process!  
Retry  
**C**  
Now you're learning - waiting to jump in is really helpful in the kind of collaboration I need.  
Edit  
Thank you for that feedback - you're absolutely right. I was getting ahead of myself instead of following your lead and understanding your vision first.  
I'm ready to listen and learn about what you have in mind for Part 3, rather than assuming or jumping to solutions. What direction are you thinking of taking this next phase?  
Retry  
**C**  
One of the core realities of the course that your simulated student brought up is that they might not be exactly familiar with various ethical models and I don't want them to immediately ask AI to teach them. That is inefficient (token-wise), prone to potential errors, might introduce less rigorous or correct sources into the conversation, and offsets learning onto the AI as explainer rather than student as explorer.  
Edit  
That's a really important pedagogical point. You want students to do the actual learning work themselves rather than having AI spoon-feed them ethical frameworks, which would undermine the educational process and potentially give them shallow or inaccurate understanding.  
So Part 3 would need to direct students to do their own research and learning about ethical frameworks first, before bringing that knowledge back to AI-assisted analysis of their personal heuristics.  
Are you thinking of having them research frameworks through assigned readings, textbook chapters, or other course materials first, and then return to AI for the comparative analysis work once they've done that foundational learning themselves?  
Retry  
**C**  
Well, yes and no. There are assigned readings, but not in the traditional sense of everyone following the same sequence. I think Part 3 is taking the results of Part 1 and Part 2 and planning out an effective road map for the student's personal interests, with assistance from AI in guiding them about how to proceed. I do have a table of contents for the textbook they will have access to, and I think that will be an important part of this conversation. Here it is...

* Balancing the Scales - The Calculus of Utilitarian Ethics
* Duty Calls - Exploring Deontological Ethics
* Virtue Ethics - The Role of Character in Moral Philosophy
* Universal Order - Unveiling Natural Law Theory
* Bound By Agreement - The Principles of Social Contract Theory
* Marxism - The Class Struggle and Its Ethical Implications
* Breaking the Moral Mold - Nietzsche on Value Creation and Perspectivism
* The Ethics of Simone De Beauvior - Feminism, Existentialism, and Ambiguity
* Environmental Ethics
* Bioethics

Edit  
Ah, that's a much more sophisticated approach! You're creating a personalized learning pathway where the AI helps students strategically choose which ethical frameworks from the available options would be most relevant and illuminating for their specific dilemma and discovered heuristics.  
So Part 3 would involve the AI analyzing their Part 1 dilemma and Part 2 heuristics, then recommending a curated sequence of 3-4 frameworks (from that table of contents) that would create the most productive tensions, insights, or challenges to their current ethical operating system.  
This is much more efficient than having everyone slog through all frameworks, and it creates a personalized learning experience where students can see direct relevance to their own situation. The AI becomes a learning strategist rather than a content deliverer.  
Am I understanding the direction correctly? The AI would essentially say "Based on your workplace power dynamics and your guilt-management heuristics, you should start with Social Contract Theory, then move to Marxist analysis, then finish with Virtue Ethics because that sequence will challenge your assumptions in this specific order..."  
Retry  
**C**  
Nope, even that is too directive. I think Part 3 is asking students to think about what is uncovered in Parts 1 and 2. For example, which responses made you the most uncomfortable about your aspirational vs real heuristics? Perhaps if we look more about models that echo these real practices, you might be a little more at ease? Or perhaps you might want to see if there are aspects of what you aspire toward that could actually implement some of the real behaviors you use in more palatable ways? Their responses could then provide suggestions about where to start or how.  
Edit  
Ah, now I see! Part 3 is much more reflective and student-driven. The AI isn't prescribing a learning path - it's helping students process their own reactions to the discoveries from Part 2 and then guiding them to identify their own learning priorities.  
So the AI would be asking questions like:

* "What surprised you most about your discovered heuristics?"
* "Which patterns made you most uncomfortable, and why?"
* "Are there gaps you discovered that you'd like to understand better?"
* "Do you want to find frameworks that validate some of your actual practices, or challenge them?"
* "Are you more interested in refining what you already do, or exploring completely different approaches?"

And then based on how the student answers those reflective questions, the AI helps them think through which frameworks from the textbook might serve their particular learning goals - whether that's finding theoretical backing for practices they're comfortable with, or challenging assumptions that created discomfort.  
The student drives the inquiry based on their own curiosity and discomfort, rather than following a predetermined analytical sequence.  
Is that closer to what you're envisioning?  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes. Students are not likely to have deep familiarity with these models, and so would likely either select ones that seem familiar or that might be less threatening to their status quo. By asking them where they might want to go, we can use their own insights to help them discover what they really want rather than what they think they want, if that makes sense.  
Edit  
Perfect! That's a brilliant pedagogical insight. Students might consciously gravitate toward frameworks that sound familiar or safe, but their actual emotional responses and areas of discomfort from Part 2 reveal what they really need to explore for genuine growth.  
So Part 3 becomes a kind of therapeutic inquiry where the AI helps students discover their authentic learning needs by exploring their reactions to their own patterns. The student who was most uncomfortable with their "self-preservation over justice" heuristic might think they want to study virtue ethics (sounds noble), but their actual discomfort might indicate they really need to grapple with social contract theory or even Marxist analysis of power structures.  
The AI becomes a reflective interviewer again, but this time helping students decode their own emotional and intellectual responses to guide them toward the frameworks that will create the most meaningful tension and growth - not necessarily the ones that feel comfortable or familiar.  
It's like psychological detective work to uncover what they actually need to study, using their own insights as the primary data source.  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes! And this way, the student sets out their map, with help from AI, rather than a color by numbers approach from an instructor. They can report their plan to me once they get it figured out. I also don't necessarily want to think of their plans in strictly linear, weekly blocs; we have a specific time limit to cover everything, but we want to give students the chance to spend time where it might be the most impactful for their own development, rather than just the ease of structure.  
Edit  
Exactly! This creates authentic ownership of their learning journey. Students develop their own strategic plan based on their genuine needs and curiosities, rather than following a predetermined sequence that might not match their developmental readiness or interests.  
And the flexibility around pacing is really important - some students might need to sit with one challenging framework for weeks to really grapple with it, while others might quickly see connections across multiple frameworks. The constraint is the semester timeline, but within that, they can allocate their attention where it will do the most work for their personal ethical development.  
This also means when they report their plan to you, you're getting insight into both their self-awareness (how well they understood their Part 2 discoveries) and their learning instincts (what they think will challenge or develop them most). That's much richer assessment data than just checking if they completed Week 4's assigned reading.  
The AI becomes a planning consultant helping them think strategically about their own learning needs and time allocation, rather than a content tutor or assignment manager.  
Should we start working on the structure for this Part 3 process?  
Retry  
**C**  
Absolutely.  
Edit  
Great! Let me think through the structure for Part 3.  
I'm envisioning this as another AI-guided process where students:

1. First reflect on their Part 2 discoveries with AI guidance - processing their emotional reactions, surprises, and areas of discomfort
2. Then explore what those reactions reveal about their actual learning needs and curiosities
3. Finally work with AI to map out a personalized study plan using the available frameworks from your textbook

A few structural questions before I start drafting:  
Format: Should this follow the same pattern as Parts 1 and 2 - with AI coaching instructions that students copy/paste, followed by a starter prompt?  
End product: Should this culminate in a learning plan artifact they can submit to you for review/approval, similar to how Part 1 ended with the ethical dilemma draft?  
Scope: Are you thinking 3-4 frameworks from the table of contents, or could some students reasonably choose fewer/more depending on their needs and the time they want to spend with each?  
Integration: Should the AI also help them think about how they'll bring their learning back to their original dilemma, or is that a separate future step?  
What's your sense on these elements?  
Retry  
**C**  
Format - yep. It seems to be working well so far, so let's try one more bite at the apple. End product - I want to be informed, but not necessarily having approval over their plan; it's their plan after all and at the end of the semester, their performance should be measured about the choices they make and how they execute on those choices. But I want to be able to throw lifelines if I see a student struggling. More about that in a different conversation. Scope: for the sake of the survey nature of the course, they should cover all the models, though some can be superficial if they can authentically explain how the model does not impact or inform their heuristic models from an informed perspective, but I need to see evidence in their work that they took each model seriously, though more time can be spent in the most topically relevant areas to their preferred approach - dealing with strengths or weaknesses in their decision-making processes as evidenced in Parts 1 and 2.  
Edit  
Perfect! That clarifies the scope really well - all models need to be engaged with seriously, but students can allocate their time and depth based on relevance to their personal ethical development needs. They need to demonstrate informed engagement even if they conclude a framework doesn't significantly impact their thinking.  
And I like that you want visibility into their plans for support purposes rather than approval - much more in line with the student-ownership approach.  
One more clarification on Integration: Should Part 3 just focus on creating the learning roadmap, or should the AI also help them think about how they'll document/demonstrate their engagement with each framework as they work through it?  
In other words, is Part 3 purely about planning the journey, or does it also need to address how they'll show their work along the way for your assessment purposes?  
Once I know that, I can start drafting the Part 3 structure following the same format as Parts 1 and 2.  
Retry  
**C**  
Let's save the how to Part 4. With the limits of free models, I don't want students hitting the limit again and again and again just to get through one part.  
Edit  
Smart thinking! Breaking it into digestible chunks that respect token limits makes perfect sense.  
So Part 3 is purely the strategic planning phase - helping students reflect on their Part 2 discoveries, identify their learning priorities, and create a personalized roadmap for engaging with all the frameworks in a way that maximizes their personal ethical development.  
Part 4 can then focus on the execution and documentation methods.  
I'll draft Part 3 now following the same format as Parts 1 and 2, focusing on the reflective inquiry and strategic planning process.  
Retry  
**C**  
Yes, please. Let's go.  
Edit  
Part 3 - Personal Learning Roadmap Guide with AI Strategic Planning  
Document  
# Personal Learning Roadmap Guide with AI Strategic Planning

## For Students: How to Use This Guide

You've completed Parts 1 and 2 - you have identified your complex ethical dilemma and discovered your authentic decision-making heuristics across mu  
There's Part 3! This follows the same structure as Parts 1 and 2, but focuses on helping students strategically plan their semester-long exploration based on their authentic reactions to their Part 2 discoveries.  
The key elements are:

* Deep reflective processing of their emotional reactions to discovered heuristics
* Strategic thinking about framework relevance to their specific development needs
* Creating a realistic plan that covers all frameworks but allocates depth based on personal priorities
* Maintaining student ownership of learning choices while ensuring comprehensive engagement

Should we test this with our sample student to see how the planning process would work?  
Retry  
**C**  
Since this one is new, I think I will take on the role of student, but upload this into a new chat to create a more authentic experience that let's me gauge time, effort, and expectations from the student view.  
Edit  
That's a smart approach! Testing it yourself as a student in a fresh conversation will give you much better insight into the actual user experience - the cognitive load, time requirements, emotional intensity, and whether the process flows naturally without the context of our design conversation.  
You'll be able to assess:

* Whether the reflective inquiry actually surfaces authentic learning priorities
* If the strategic planning process feels genuinely helpful vs. overwhelming
* How well the AI coaching instructions work in practice
* Whether the end product (learning roadmap) matches what you envision students creating

Taking it through a real AI conversation will also reveal any gaps or unclear instructions that might not be obvious when we're just designing it conceptually.  
Good luck with the test! I'm curious to hear how it goes from the student perspective.  
Retry  
**C**  
Could you quickly generate a Part 2 report I could download?  
Edit  
Part 2 Heuristics Discovery Report  
Document  
# Part 2: Ethical Heuristics Discovery Report

\*\*Student:\*\* [Sample Student Response]  
\*\*Date:\*\* July 30, 2025  
\*\*Ethical Dilemma:\*\* Coffee shop scheduling practices that disadvantage older workers

---

## Discovered Heuristics by Role

### \*\*EMPL  
Here's a downloadable Part 2 report you can use to test the Part 3 process! This captures all the key discoveries from our sample student's heuristics interview in a format that would be ready for the strategic planning phase.  
Retry  
[Claude can make mistakes. Please double-check responses.](https://support.anthropic.com/en/articles/8525154-claude-is-providing-incorrect-or-misleading-responses-what-s-going-on)  
Sonnet 4  
Claude

**C**  
Clayn  
Free plan